



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,503	11/02/1999	THOMAS R. CECH	15389-002611	1130

34151 7590 03/06/2007  
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP  
8TH FLOOR  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
----------

ANGELL, JON E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1635

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/432,503

Applicant(s)

CECH ET AL.

Examiner

Jon Eric Angell

Art Unit

1635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 41-62 and 65-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 41-57 and 74-82 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-62 and 65-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Attended
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment filed 10/18/2006 is acknowledged and has been entered.

Applicant's arguments are addressed on a per section basis. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this Action can be found in a prior Office Action. Any rejections not reiterated in this action have been withdrawn as being obviated by the amendment of the claims and/or applicant's arguments.

Claims 41-62 and 65-82 are currently pending and are addressed herein.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 58-62 and 65-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for:

A method for accelerating the healing of an epithelial wound comprising directly administering to the site of the epithelial wound a nucleic acid vector that encodes and expresses Telomerase Reverse Transcriptase (TRT);

does not reasonably provide enablement for the full scope encompassed by the claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1635

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described by the court in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CA FC 1988).

*Wands* states on page 1404,

“Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman*. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.”

#### The nature of the invention

The instant claims are drawn to a method of reducing damage due to impaired replication of cells in a tissue or organ *in vivo*. It is noted that “reducing damage” clearly indicates that the method is a methods of treatment. Thus, the nature of the invention is biomedical therapy and includes gene therapy for treating humans having disease or disorder.

#### The breadth of the claims

As indicated above, the claims are very broad and encompass methods of reducing damage due to impaired replication (i.e., treatment) by increasing telomerase enzyme activity in the cell by administering to the cell a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that has telomerase catalytic activity when complexed with a telomerase RNA. With respect to “reducing due to impaired replication” (i.e., treatment of disease/disorder), it is respectfully pointed out that the claims are not limited to treating any particular specific disease/disorder and the specification specifically contemplates treating a vast array of different diseases including: cancer, Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease, stroke, graying of hair, hair loss, wound healing,

Art Unit: 1635

osteoporosis, age-related immune system impairment, atherosclerosis, diabetes, muscle atrophy, etc. (e.g., see p. 98-100). Furthermore, the claims do not specifically indicate how the polynucleotide is delivered to the cells; therefore, the claims embrace any type of administration/delivery of the therapeutic molecule. Therefore, given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the claims encompass a method for treating any disease/disorder using the claimed method by any means of administration.

The unpredictability of the art and the state of the prior art

With respect to the claims as they encompass in vivo embodiments (as indicated above) the claims encompass gene therapy for treating disease. Regarding gene therapy as a whole, the art at the time of filing considered gene therapy to be unpredictable as modes of delivery that would provide efficient expression of genes encoding the therapeutic polypeptide sufficient to provide an alleviation of symptoms related to the target disease or condition had not been developed. Currently, the state of the art of gene therapy is still in its infancy as the art is plagued by unpredictability. For instance, ANDERSON (Nature 392(Suppl):25-30; 1998) teaches,

“Except for anecdotal reports of individual patients being helped, there is still no conclusive evidence that a gene therapy protocol has been successful in the treatment of a human disease (p.25, first paragraph)... The challenge is to develop gene therapy as an efficient and safe drug-delivery system. The goal is more difficult to achieve than many investigators had predicted 5 years ago. (p. 25 , second paragraph)... Several major deficiencies still exist including poor delivery systems, both viral and non-viral, and poor gene expression after genes are delivered. The reason for the low efficiency of gene transfer and expression in human patients is that we still lack a basic understanding of how vectors should be constructed, what regulatory sequences are appropriate for which cell types, how in vivo immune defenses can be overcome and how to manufacture efficiently the vectors we do make.”(See p. 30).

Art Unit: 1635

With respect to using TRT for gene therapy, the relevant art indicates that there are a number of problems that must be overcome in order for TRT gene therapy to be considered predictable. For instance, HORNSBY et al. (J. Anti-Aging Med, 2000) teaches,

“The use of telomerized cells depends on expression of (hTERT) not causing changes that predispose cells to abnormalities of any kind, particularly neoplastic conversion. Since the initial reports of telomerization, conflicting data have been presented with respect to risks of abnormalities in cells that have been telomerized... The data that have been obtained so far do not unequivocally show the (hTERT) is able to immortalize cells without the production of any abnormalities... Other data, in fact, suggest that immortalization by (hTERT) could predispose cells to neoplastic transformation. Most significant is the finding that expression of (hTERT) is required for full tumorigenicity in human cells also expressing mutated Ras and large T/small t antigens from SV40... Considering the available data, we cannot yet predict whether telomerized cells transplanted into a host animal do in fact present a cancer risk; this can only be determined directly by long-term observation, and this has not yet been done.” (See p. 412)

HORNSBY also teaches,

“The future prospects for the use of telomerized cells are significant. As emphasized here, major efforts need to be made to be sure that telomerization is safe when applied to cells for use in human therapy.” (See p.416)

OSTLER et al. (J. Ped. Endocrin. & Metab., 2000) teaches that telomerase (hTERT) has been shown to halt telomere shortening and is sufficient to prevent senescence in at least three human cell types (fibroblasts, vascular endothelial cells and retinal pigmented cells) conferring first extended life span and then formal immortality (e.g., see last paragraph p. 1472).

Regarding telomere-driven senescence mechanisms in other mammals, OSTLER teaches,

“It is unlikely, however, that this [telomere-driven senescence] mechanism operated in rodent species. Rodents have much greater mean telomere lengths than humans, a significant spontaneous escape frequency from senescence (10-6/cell/generation compared with 10-12/cell/generation in humans) and (more seriously) some rodent fibroblasts have been shown to undergo senescence in the presence of active telomerase.” (See p. 1473, first paragraph).

Regarding the possible use of Telomerase for therapeutic purposes, OSTLER teaches,

“There is considerable popular interest in the potential application of telomerase to tissue engineering and anti-aging therapies. Leaving aside the practical difficulties of the safe use of telomerase, it is clear that ectopic expression of the enzyme (or even transient telomerase reactivation) should not be treated as a ‘one size fits all’ intervention for compromised replicative capacity in every tissue.” (See p. 1474).

Therefore, it is clear that the relevant art recognizes that treating diseases that are contemplated by the specification is harder than merely increasing the proliferation of cells associated with the disease and a number of different factors have to also be considered and addressed before TRT gene therapy can be considered a predictable art.

#### Working Examples and Guidance in the Specification

The specification shows the nucleic acid (and amino acid) sequences that encode a few different TRT genes from different species, and indicates the potentially conserved homologous domains of the different TRTs (e.g., see Fig. 4). The specification also shows that expression of hTRT in different cells types, wherein the cells are in vitro (e.g., see Fig. 5 and Example 2). The specification also shows that the co-expression of hTRT and hTR are required for telomerase catalytic activity in a cell, in vitro (that is, both TRT and the Telomerase RNA are required) (e.g., see Fig. 10). The specification, however, does not have any working examples wherein the target cells are in vivo. Furthermore, the specification does not show how the polynucleotide encoding the TRT can be administered to the correct target cell in vivo, and how to avoid transformation of non-target cells in vivo. The specification does not indicate any specific functional variants or fragments of hTRT that can be used in the claimed method. The specification does disclose that deleting certain specific domains of the polypeptide eliminates

Art Unit: 1635

the catalytic activity of the protein, but there is no evidence presented indicating that any specific fragment or variant of hTRT (i.e. SEQ ID NO: 2) has catalytic activity when expressed in a cell.

It is noted that the Declaration of Dr. Harley discusses experiments disclosed in Application 10/143,536, wherein cells transfected with an adenoviral vector which expresses hTRT were directly administered to an epithelial wound on a rabbit ear and the results indicate that there is an acceleration in the healing of the wound compared with controls.

#### Quantity of Experimentation

Considering the vast breadth of the claims, an enormous amount of additional experimentation would be required in order for one of skill in the art to be able to predictably use the claimed invention to its full scope. For instance, additional experimentation would be required in order to be able to use the claimed method to treat a mammal having a disease/disorder. Considering the problems recognized in the art at the time of filing and in the post-filing art (indicated above), it is clear that the additional experimentation would not be a matter of "routine experimentation". Furthermore, the evidence presented in the instant specification (e.g., see Fig 10) indicates that in order to produce a telomerase catalytic activity in a cell both the TRT and TR genes must be expressed in the cells (i.e., the cells must have both the telomerase enzyme and the telomerase RNA unit).

#### Level of the skill in the art

The level of the skill in the art is deemed to be high, considering the complex nature of biomedical therapy.



Art Unit: 1635

Conclusion

Considering that the claims are extremely broad such that they encompass methods that can be performed either in vitro or in vivo, and considering that the in vivo embodiments of the claims encompass treating a vast number and different types of diseases wherein the mere increasing of the proliferation of the cells associated with the disease would not be expected to result in treatment of the disease, the claims are not enabled to the full scope that they embrace. That is, considering the nature of the invention (gene therapy) and the vast breadth of the claims (treating any disease via any type of administration) in view of the teaching in the art that gene therapy is unpredictable and in view of the limited working examples and guidance provided at the time filing, as well as the high degree of skill required to practice the claimed invention, it is concluded that the amount of experimentation required to perform the broadly claimed invention is undue.

***Response to Amendment/Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2006 have been fully considered.

Applicant's argued that the amendment to the claims overcomes the rejection.

This is not persuasive because the instant claims encompass "reducing damage due to impaired replication of cells in a tissue organ of a mammal, *in vivo*." The phrase "reducing damage" clearly indicates that the method is for treatment. However, the specification, in view of all of the evidence of record, does not enable the full scope encompassed by the instant claims. The specification only provides an enabling disclosure for that which is indicated herein (accelerating the healing of an epithelial wound).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 41-57 and 74-82 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon Eric Angell whose telephone number is 571-272-0756. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Douglas Schultz can be reached on 571-272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1635

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J.E. Angell  
AU1635



J.E. ANGELL, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER